

Remarks

Claims 1-7 and 9-20 currently stand rejected and remain pending. Claim 8 was canceled in a previous response. No claims are amended herein. The Assignee respectfully traverses the rejections and requests allowance of claims 1-7 and 9-20.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,598,179 to Chirashnya et al. (hereinafter “Chirashnya”). (Page 2 of the final Office action.) Claims 5 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chirashnya in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,398 to Leong et al. (hereinafter “Leong”). (Page 5 of the final Office action.) Also, claims 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chirashnya in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,704 to Prorock (hereinafter “Prorock”). (Page 8 of the final Office action.) The Assignee respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the following discussion.

Independent method claim 1 is reproduced below for convenience, with emphasis supplied:

1. A method for processing events from electronic architecture, the architecture having a plurality of entities generating the events, comprising the steps of:
 - extracting the events from the architecture;
 - separating the events according to the entities;
 - transforming the events to one or more text strings; and
 - analyzing the one or more text strings to produce a human interpretable statement summarizing at least one of the events associated with the one or more text strings.*

Independent system claim 18 incorporates similar provisions.

Generally, Chirashnya discloses an error log analyzer (ELA) which “scans error logs generated by a computer system.” (Column 2, lines 6-8.) The ELA processes the error log data in three stages: (1) a selection stage (selecting errors which are “of relevance to fault conditions of interest”); (2) a filtering stage (filtering and combining the errors into events known to be associated with particular fault conditions); and (3) an analysis stage (checking the events to decide whether a fault exists that requires service attention). (Column 2, lines 15-29.)

With respect to claims 1 and 18, the final Office action indicates that Chirashnya teaches analyzing the text strings and producing a human interpretable statement summarizing at least one of the events associated with the one or more text strings at column 11, line 57, to column 12, line 20. (Pages 3 and 9 of the final Office action.) More specifically, the final Office action states “that at least the ‘result number’ is [a] text string. For example, Table IV at Col. 12 shows the result number is text strings ‘R1’ and ‘R2’.” (Page 11 of the final Office action.)

The Assignee respectfully disagrees. Instead, Chirashnya discloses a Results Table 42 (shown in Fig. 1), wherein each line of the table holds a *result number*, a corresponding *message number*, and a *Boolean indicator* as to whether a field-replaceable unit (FRU) should be reported. (See Table IV at column 12, lines 5-15.) A separate message catalog holds the messages to be provided to the user, wherein each message is associated with one or more of the result numbers of the Results Table. (See the “Catalog File Examples” at column 12, lines 17-19.) In other words, *numbers and Boolean values* are used as input to present the messages to the user.

Further, Chirashnya indicates specifically with respect to Table IV that the first column is “the *entry number* (i.e., the corresponding *Result_Num*)...” Chirashnya further discloses pseudocode equating the variable “Result” with “Result_Num.” (See “Result = Result_Num” several times within Table III, found at column 10, line 37.) Further, the specific examples listed beginning at column 10, line 53, all show the Result variable representing an *integer number, not a text string*. (See “Result = 1” at column 10, line 54, “Result = 3 at column 10, line 59, “Result = 5” at column 11, line 2, and “Result = 1” at column 11, line 3.) Since Result is an integer, and Result is equated with a Result Number, the Result Number must always be an integer, *not* a text string; otherwise, a data-type conflict would result. Further, at no point does Chirashnya refer to the result number as a text string, but only as a number. The use of the letter “R” before the result numbers 1 and 2 in Table IV merely help to distinguish the Result Number column from the “Message Number” and “Report FRU” columns. In addition, if a textual “R” were actually used as part of every Result Number, the “R” would not help distinguish one result number from another, thus making the use of a text string worthless in that situation. Moreover, the “Result” values above would not be merely integers, such as 1, 3, 5, and so on, but would also include a text-format value (such as ASCII) for the letter “R” (e.g., the hexadecimal number 52H). The only strings actually discussed in Chirashnya are those relating to the user messages apparently

employed in the final Office action as the “human interpretable statement” of claim 1. (Page 3 of the Office action, citing column 12, lines 5-20 of Chirashnya.) Thus, Chirashnya does not teach or suggest *text strings* being analyzed to provide a human interpretable statement, as provided for in claims 1 and 18.

Thus, in light of at least the foregoing reasons, the Assignee contends that amended claims 1 and 18 are allowable in view of Chirashnya, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 and 9-17 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 19 and 20 depend from independent claim 18, thus incorporating the provisions of their independent claims. Thus, the Assignee asserts that claims 2-7, 9-17, 19 and 20 are allowable for at least the reasons presented above in support of claims 1 and 18, and such indication is respectfully requested.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, the Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 rejections of claims 1-7 and 9-20.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Assignee submits that claims 1-7 and 9-20 are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Assignee thus respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-7 and 9-20.

The Assignee believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine additional fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/12/07



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Kyle J. Way, Reg. No. 45,549

Setter Roche LLP

Telephone: (720) 562-2280

E-mail: kyle@setterroche.com

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 022879

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400